28th February 1929]

A.—(a) & (b) A report [a] on the subject received from the Surgeon-General is laid on the table.

(c) 10 a.m. to 1 p.m

Public Health

Propagation of the evils of consuming opium and liquor.

*1528 Q.—Mr. C. GOPALA MENON: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to place on the table of the House copies of the instructions given to the officers of the Health department to carry on propaganda on the evils of opium and liquor consumption?

A.—G.O. No. 1776, P.H., dated 25th August 1925, [b] and G.O. No. 924, P.H., dated 11th May 1927, [b] are placed on the table.

Mr. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR:—"It is stated in the answer that there is no objection for Public Health officers drawing attention to the effects of intoxicants. May I ask if they have been given positive instructions to carry on propaganda against drinking?"

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR:—"The order is printed at pages 19 and 20 which says 'there is no objection to officers of the Public Health department drawing attention in their lectures to the effects of intoxicants on the human body and to the evil results on health of an excessive use of them'."

Mr. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR:—"With reference to that very point I am asking whether they have been asked to preach for prohibition and whether anybody has done so."

The hon. Mr S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR:—"The matter which the hon. Member has referred to is under the consideration of the Government. Orders will issue soon."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU:—"With reference to G.O. No 924, may I ask whether the Government have passed any orders defining what amounts to excessive drink, whether it is the drinking of 6 bottles or 20 bottles?"

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR:—"I have no idea. The Government have no idea of making any such determination."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether the policy of the Government is that officers of the Excise department will not be promoted if the excise revenue falls?"

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR:—"I do not know of any change of policy. But I doubt whether there was any such policy at any time."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know if the excise revenue falls in a certain area it will be a disqualification for the officer of that area for promotion?"

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR:—"If the Government think that the fall in the revenue is due to an improper conduct or slackness of the officer, then he will not be promoted, on the other hand, if the Government think that it is due to reduction of the quantity in drinking, it will be no bar to the promotion of the officer."

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on pages 267–268 infra.

[b] Printed as Appendix III on page 269 infra.

[28th February 1929

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Is it not the duty of the Excise officer to see that the revenue does not fall ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" It is the duty of the Excise Department to see that revenue does not fall owing to want of detection of crimes or combination among bidders. It is not the duty of the department to see that drink is increased. The Government of India have issued definite orders to that effect."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" With regard to this Government order, may I know why the Government have not instructed their Health Officers to preach on the evil effects of any use of alcohol ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I am afraid the hon. Member did not hear the answer I gave to Mr. Madhavan Nayar. I said that that matter was under the consideration of the Government and that orders would issue soon."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I know if there is any proposal that the Excise Department should preach against drink ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" There is no such proposal at present."

Alleged negligent treatment of one Angamma in the Government Maternity Hospital.

*1529 Q.—Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether one lady by name Angamma was admitted to the Government Maternity Hospital at 8 a.m. on 11th December 1927 with labour pains ;

(b) whether she was operated at 12 noon on the same date by the assistant of the hospital ;

(c) whether she died the same day ;

(d) whether on two previous occasions she had been successfully operated for the removal of the child by the Superintendent ;

(e) why she was not operated this time by the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent ;

(f) whether it is a fact that the Superintendent when informed of the arrival of this case sent word that he was busy and that the particular assistant must operate on her ;

(g) whether when after an hour or so he was informed that the assistant was not in the hospital, he wrote back saying that that particular assistant should be sent for and that he should do the operation ;

(h) what the delay involved was in all this correspondence ;

(i) whether it is a fact that the Superintendent is provided with quarters so that he might attend to all serious cases ; and

(j) if so, why he did not personally look into this case ?

A.—(a) A patient named Angamma was admitted into the hospital at 8-45 a.m. on 11th December 1927.

(b) She was operated on the same day at 11-25 a.m. by the Assistant Professor of Midwifery.

(c) & (d) Yes.